



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ASSOCIATIVE AND APPERCEPTIVE TYPES OF SENTENCE STRUCTURE.

WHILE there is no question that literary criticism abounds in dogmatic books on style, in which the law is laid down as to how one ought to write, there are on the other hand very few investigations of an analytic character, attempting to show how prosaists actually have written, and why they have shaped their style in just such and such a manner. In German even less work has been done in this line than in English. The reasons are obvious to anybody who will compare the curriculum of the English or American college with that of the German institutions with regard to the importance ascribed to the study of the native tongue. Whatever one may think of the relation between objective and subjective (individual) stylistics, it is safe to say that the main reason for neglecting the latter is found in the complexity of the problem. Provided that it is mainly the power of individuality which chemicalizes, as it were, a given material of language and moulds it into what we call style, it is evident that a true history of prose style is one of the most difficult tasks to be undertaken, because it implies an insight into as many individualities as there are writers. No branch of philological or literary work requires a greater variety of points of view, and while brilliant aphorisms or a powerful deduction of one predominating principle may be of great heuristic value, it is only the combination of several points of view, the method of "reciprocal elucidation," as Scherer calls it, which will free us from mechanical classifications and give us an organic view of the problem of individuality.

If we were to undertake the grouping of these various elements which constitute style, a practical scheme might be obtained by formulating the problem of style as the problem of the relation between the individual writer and the various forces or conditions by which he is determined. Among these there are five which are of special importance: 1) material (type

of language); 2) class of writing (narrative, descriptive, etc.); 3) environment (spirit of the age, philosophy of the writer); 4) process of writing (spontaneous, elaborated, etc.); 5) process and form of thinking. The last of these 5 points of view implies the question: How were the ideas formed and organized at the moment they were embodied in language and in how far is this mental process reflected in language or does it produce a type of style? It is evident that a stylistic investigation based on this question will exhibit a purely psychological character, and it is from this psychological point of view only that certain forms of prose style will be examined in the following article.

The problem of style has only very recently been approached from this side, namely in Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie*, or rather the first part of it, *Die Sprache*. But the methods applied in this book are so clearly formulated and have at once yielded such definite results that they encourage a more detailed investigation on the psychological basis. It is well known that Wundt's epoch-making book is essentially a practical application of his long-established system of psychology, which in its most condensed form may be found in his *Grundriss der Psychologie* (4th edition, Leipzig, 1901). In referring to this book with regard to the elementary principles of Wundt's psychology, we pass on, without further preliminaries, to those chapters in his book on language, in which the fundamental theories on sentence structure are discussed.

The basis of our investigation is Wundt's definition of the sentence (p. 240):¹ "The sentence is the analysis and organization of a unit of thought accomplished by bringing its elements into logical relations."² We have furthermore to realize that

¹ All quotations given under *Wundt* refer to the second volume of his book, *Die Sprache*, which forms the first part of his *Völkerpsychologie*.

² I hope I have succeeded in giving a fairly good translation of this fundamental definition, the original of which runs as follows: "Der Satz ist der sprachliche Ausdruck für die willkürliche Gliederung einer Gesamtvorstellung in ihre in logische Beziehungen zu einander gesetzten Bestandteile." The adjective, 'willkürliche,' which is here the psychological term for a 'volitional action,' has been omitted, because this feature of the process is immaterial for our purposes. The main difficulty lies in the accurate rendering of the word: 'Gliederung,' which implies both the analysis and synthesis, a unity in variety, though the stress is laid upon the analytical act.

the entire process of forming a sentence consists of three stages : 1, the formation of the unit, a synthetic act ; 2, the analysis ; 3, the binding together by the elements of relation, which is another synthetic act. There are consequently two moments in our thinking during which we take a comprehensive view of a compound thought: the moment before and after the analysis ; the first time it stands vaguely, the second time more clearly before our consciousness. As to the analysis it is important to realize the dichotomy of the logical forms of thought. By a strictly apperceptive act every unit is divided into two parts, the idea of an object, and of a quality or condition, perceived in this object. The formula \widehat{ab} expresses the simplest form of an apperceptive unit or of a judgment. Wundt constantly emphasizes the fact that this form of predicative thinking is by no means the original form, but rather an advanced one. He shows that in accordance with the frequency of attributive forms in primitive languages, all languages had to pass through a stage, in which the attributive form prevailed. It is the copula which performed the task of changing the attributive into the predicative form, and the triumph of the latter is one of the most important events in the inner history of language. This development seen from a broader point of view is only a special case of the general law that all apperception, that is the faculty of perceiving an idea distinctly and giving it the preference to other ideas by a voluntary action, rests upon associations, the more primitive form of thought.

To return to the conditions of language, we find, in distinction from the strictly dichotomic type of apperception, another type, which shows the associate character, a passive form of thought, a mere flow of ideas, without giving any one the preference over another. This type, the open connection, Wundt symbolizes by a horizontal bar, indicating that an element of the sentence is loosely attached : $a\widehat{b}-$. The associative type in its purest form, i. e., the attributive sentence structure, is nowadays confined to primitive languages, as stated above. But though all literary languages are based upon the apperceptive form of thought, the associative forms or loosely added parts are indispensable and

occupy a more or less prominent place according to the writer and the occasion. Wundt illustrates this by analyzing two periods, one of which is taken from Goethe's early prose writing, and abounds in emotional abrupt clauses of a distinctly associative character, while the second period shows the calm, apperceptive flow of thought of his later style (p. 342 f.).

It is up to this point that Wundt carries his investigations; the reason why he did not touch upon the stylistic side of the problem may be seen in the general ethnological character of his book, in which there was little room left for the discussion of subtle details bordering partly on the field of æsthetics. However that may be, it seems to me that the establishment of these two main types may be used as a foundation upon which to build a system of types, and that in this way we may be able to find a clue to a great many stylistic problems on a strictly psychological basis.

If we undertake here to construct such a system of types it must be emphasized first of all that in presenting a certain number of types and a certain arrangement of them, we make no claim to completeness or to a definite solution of the problem. The complexity of the conditions and forces that constitute style accounts sufficiently for the endless variety of sentence-forms imaginable. Nevertheless it seems feasible to reduce these many possibilities and mixed forms to a small number of types, the character of which largely depends on the general character of the language upon which the classification is based. The system given below will apply to all Indo-Germanic languages.¹ With regard to the degree of frequency it need hardly be stated that in most writers almost every type will be found; on the other hand it could be easily shown that a tendency towards one or the other or several types prevails in nearly every writer, and that very few of them display an absolute freedom and an unlimited variety of sentence-forms.

¹ The illustrations in this article are mostly taken from German and English, for the reason that I am more familiar with these two literatures than any others.

The following plan is intended to give a general survey of the various types of sentence structure which in the course of this article will be discussed in full and illustrated. The scheme of symbolic letters is identical with the one that Wundt introduces, a few slight changes excepted. U means "unit of thought" (*Gesamtvorstellung*); $\widehat{a b}$ symbolizes the "closed connection" (*geschlossene Verbindung*); $\widehat{a b} \text{---} b$ the open one. A group of letters placed beneath another group refers to a subordinate clause with descending construction: $\begin{smallmatrix} a b \\ c d \end{smallmatrix}$, while the ascending form is symbolized by juxtaposition and capitalizing the main clause: $\widehat{a b} \quad \widehat{A B}$. The figures attached to the letters representing open connections indicate the number of associative additions: $\widehat{e f} \text{---} f_1 \text{---} f_2$.

I. ASSOCIATIVE.

1) *primitive*:

$$U_1 \text{---} U_2 \text{---} U_3$$

2) *intuitive*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \widehat{a b} \\ c \text{---} d \text{---} d_1 \text{---} d_2 \text{---} d_3 \\ \widehat{e f} \text{---} f_1 \end{array}$$

3) *combining*:

$$\begin{array}{c} U \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{c} U_1 \text{---} U_2 \text{---} U_3 \text{---} U_4 \\ \widehat{a b} \quad \widehat{a b} \quad \widehat{a b} \text{---} b \quad \widehat{a b} \end{array} \right\} U_5 \quad \begin{array}{c} \widehat{A B} \text{---} \widehat{C D} \\ \widehat{E F} \end{array} \end{array}$$

II. APPERCEPTIVE.

1) *isolating*:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{a) } \widehat{a b} & \text{b) } \widehat{a b} \quad \widehat{A B} & \text{c) } \begin{array}{c} a b \\ c d \end{array} \end{array}$$

2) *narrative*:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{a) } \overbrace{a \ b} \text{---} \overbrace{b \ A} \text{---} B & \text{b) } \begin{array}{c} U_1 \\ \overbrace{a \ b} \\ \overbrace{c \ d} \end{array} \text{---} U_2 \end{array}$$

3) *interlocked*:

$$\begin{array}{c} U \\ \hline \begin{array}{cc} U_1 & U_2 \\ \overbrace{a \ b} \text{---} \overbrace{a_1 \ b_1} & \overbrace{A \ B} \\ \overbrace{c \ d} & \overbrace{C \ D} \text{---} \overbrace{C_1 \ D_1} \\ \overbrace{e \ f} \text{---} \overbrace{e_1 \ f_1} & \\ \overbrace{i \ k} \quad \overbrace{l \ m} \text{---} \overbrace{l_1 \ m_1} & \\ & \overbrace{o \ p} \end{array} \end{array}$$

4) *analytical*:

$$\begin{array}{c} U \\ \hline \begin{array}{cc} U_1 & U_2 \\ \overbrace{a \ b} & \overbrace{A \ B} \\ \overbrace{c \ d} & \overbrace{C \ D} \\ \overbrace{e \ f} & \end{array} \end{array}$$

5) *synthetical*:

$$\text{a) } \overbrace{U_1 \ U_2} \qquad \text{c) } \overbrace{\overbrace{U_1} \ U_2}$$

I, 1. In turning first to the simplest type of the associative group we need hardly explain the formula $U_1 \text{---} U_2 \text{---} U_3 \text{---}$, which represents the crudest form of linking associations together in a *primitive polysyndeton*, without any attempt to apperceive a unit and to analyze it. This type prevails in the speaking and writing of children or illiterate people. It is well known that children in telling their experiences are apt to begin every new clause with: "and then" or "and there." This explains itself very simply, because a child would be inclined to use such

elements of a sentence for the initial notion, which are the most important ones in emphasizing a sequence of events or which, according to Wundt's terminology, are the predominating ideas: these are of course the particles of time and space.¹ The primitive polysyndeton is likewise to be found in letters of uneducated people, because they instinctively reproduce the natural flow of their every day language.

As to the literary use, this type is naturally most appropriate in juvenile literature, fairy stories, etc. The beginning of "Sneewittchen" from Grimm's collection, may serve as an illustration: "It was winter and the snow-flakes fell from heaven like feathers, there sat a queen at a window the frame of which was of ebony, and was sewing. And as she sewed and looked up at the snow, she ran the needle into her finger and three drops of blood fell in the snow. And as the red looked so beautiful in the white snow, she thought: If I only had a child as white as snow, as red as blood and as black as the window frame." Of German writers who aimed to reproduce the sentence-structure of the lower classes and their associative tendency, I know none more successful than the Low-German poet, F. Reuter. A short passage from his novel *Stromtid* may be quoted: "So Hawermann sat there and his hands were folded and his honest blue eyes turned upward and a more beautiful light was mirrored in them than that of God's sun. Then a little maiden came running up and laid some daisies in his lap and his prayerfully uplifted hands sank and were thrown round the child: it was his child—and he rose up from the bench and took his child on his arm and in his hand he had the flowers and went with his child along the path down the garden." (Works, popular ed. VI, 197).

II, 1. The apperceptive types a-c represent forms of simple narrative, b) with preceding, c) with following subordinate clause, or b) with ascending, c) with descending construction. These types differ from the primitive associative type mainly in offering closed connections. The ideas are clearly and distinctly apperceived, that is clear in themselves and distinct from their

¹ Cf. Weil, *Order of Words* (transl. by Super), p. 31.

surroundings. I call them "*isolating*" because no larger units are formed but the field of consciousness is small and the smaller units follow each other quite rapidly in being moved towards the fixation-point (in Wundt's terminology). The advantage of the isolating type is a distinct exposition of the separate ideas, the disadvantage a certain nervous character (because the receiving mind has no time to rest and survey a broader field) in which one central idea dominates over the ascending and descending ideas. This type occurs neither in speaking nor in literature as frequently as one might suppose judging from its simplicity. I have found it in certain dialect writers as, for instance, in German: Rosegger, Auerbach, though with a strong leaning towards type II, 2. On the whole the excessive use of the isolating type may be considered as a mark of strong individuality, of studied effects or even mannerism. Notable instances of this kind are in German: Novalis, the romanticist, H. Grimm and W. Scherer, both literary critics, and Fr. Nietzsche, the philosopher.

With regard to Novalis, the studied simplicity of his prose may be explained as a reaction against the more elaborate periodic form prevailing in the literature of the eighteenth century, all the more as we observe the same tendency in other romanticists, as Brentano, Hoffmann, Eichendorf, etc. Simplicity and plain homely phrasing is characteristic of a great many romantic productions, and in keeping with their doctrine about folk-poetry and the natural expression of the inward thought-life without artificial embellishments. But not one of them goes as far as Novalis in presenting his ideas in the most abrupt form, and composing sometimes whole pages of short declarative sentences. Compare for instance the following passage from his novel *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*: "Henry was excited and did not fall asleep till towards morning. The thoughts of his soul blended in wonderful dreams. In the green plain sparkled a deep blue stream. On its smooth surface floated a boat. Mathilda sat rowing in it. She wore a wreath, was singing a simple song, and gazed across at him with a tender plaintiveness. His mind was oppressed. He did not know why. The sky was clear, the river calm. Her heavenly face was reflected in the waves. Suddenly the boat began to spin around. He cried out anxiously

to her. She smiled and laid her oars in the boat. . ." (*Novalis' Schriften*, ed. by E. Heilborn, I, 108). We might continue for two more pages and would find the same type right through, with the exception of one consecutive, two temporal, and three relative clauses. Another explanation of Novalis' style may be found in his aphoristic form of thinking. His famous *Fragmente* give the impression of inspirations hastily jotted down, breaking forth in fits and starts. How different they seem from Goethe's aphoristic thought, in which likewise fragments are presented, but each one rounded out, modified and carefully defined in its relations to cognate problems. In Novalis' aphorisms, on the contrary, we notice a feverish hunting for paradox and sharply pointed ideas, and such methods of thinking will always result in short sentences. The same might be said of Herm. Grimm, whose Goethe-biography gives evidence of this kind of style on nearly every page. With him it almost grows to be a mannerism, just as in certain novels of Felix Dahn.¹ Scherer, on the other hand, though he also indulges in sharply pointed periods, may have been influenced by a restless journalistic temperament, which makes itself so distinctly felt in his shorter essays and reviews. Scherer uses this same argument—rapid, nervous working of the reviewer—in characterizing Jacob Grimm's style, though it certainly does not apply to Grimm's orations and treatises. Scherer, by the way, states in this same article on Grimm's language (*Kleine Schriften*, I, 388) that a simple style implies moral simplicity—a statement which throws more light on Scherer's delight in coining antithetic sayings than on the problem in question. Nietzsche's style, like that of Novalis, is explained by the aphoristic tendency of his writings. He does not cultivate the 'isolating' type, however, to any great extent, except in his main work: *Also sprach Zarathustra*, a book which in its sibylline and visionary character, as if dictated by inspiration, necessarily calls for an aphoristic, lapidary style as the only adequate form of expression.

¹ An English writer who exhibits the same mannerism is Benj. Disraeli; his novels *Contarini Fleming* and *Alroy* are almost entirely written in the 'isolating' sentence-type.

Next to the aphoristic form of writing there is a certain humorous style, which by its own nature tends towards the "isolating" sentence-type and which has found its classical expression in American literature. It has nothing in common with the humor of Sterne, Jean Paul or even Dickens, but rather approaches or is influenced by Celtic wit and burlesque. The essentially American feature of this wit which distinguishes it from French "esprit" is partly the tendency to relate simple self-evident facts with a great deal of emphasis by singling out each phase of it and giving it here and there some unexpected turn,—partly the tendency to use the plainest every-day situations and most absurd objects for metaphorical purposes. In the latter respect this style of writing is greatly aided by the liberal use of slang because a great many slang expressions are pictorial phrases, humorous by general consent, thus helping to produce the effect of suggestive brevity. Without going further into the philosophy of this subject,¹ I would merely like to point out the effect which this kind of humor has upon style and that the "isolating" type is the prevailing type of sentence-structure. Nearly all the American humorists down to Eugene Field and G. Ade, offer illustrations and most of all Artemus Ward himself, the founder of this school of humor. The following passage is taken from his famous lecture on the Mormons: "Time passed on. It always does, by the way. You may have noticed that time passes on. It's a kind of way time has. I became a man. I haven't done much as an artist; but I have an uncle who takes photographs, and I have a servant who takes anything he can lay his hands on. I like art. I admire dramatic art, although I failed as an actor. It was in my schoolboy days that I failed as an actor. The play was the 'Ruins of Pompeii.' I played the ruins. It was not a successful performance. But I was better than the burning mountain. He was not good. He was a bad Vesuvius." (R. Ford, *American Humorists*, p. 19).

II, 2 and 4. In type 2 the two forms are combined, but in such a way that either the apperceptive (2 a) or associative (2 b)

¹ Cf. for instance, Brander Matthews, *Parts of Speech*, p. 194 ff; Hunt, *Style and Humor*, in his book, *Studies in Literature and Style*, p. 193 ff.

character predominates. The structure of it will become clear if compared to type 4, a type that corresponds practically to what is given as a pattern of style in books on rhetoric. Type 4 is called *analytic*, because it represents the ideal form of the analysis of a unit, in which a central idea is clearly perceived and divided into its elements by the dichotomic law in such a way that all related ideas in the whole field of consciousness arrange themselves according to their importance and relation to the goal. In how far this arrangement is well balanced, is a question of æsthetics, the discussion of which lies outside of our province. It is the style which is cultivated by English historians as Macaulay, Froude, Matthew Arnold, Washington Irving,¹ in German by such writers as Ranke, Treitschke, Schiller, etc. Only few cases of purely narrative prose seem to be represented as for instance Hawthorne, in German, Gottfried Keller and above all Goethe in his second and third period. The following sentence from Ranke's *History of the Popes* corresponds in its structure to the diagram of the analytical type (II, 4) in our plan: "Whilst the furious preachers pronounced every one excommunicated who should venture but to speak of peace with the heretic, even though he should return to the mass, the parliament recalled to memory the fundamental laws of the realm, by which foreign princes were excluded from the throne." (Kelly's translation, p. 232.)

It is evident that type 2 represents a simpler form of 4; the field of consciousness is smaller and the apperceptive power less developed, but compared to type 1, there is a decided tendency to organize a unit of thought. This intermediate stage and the elasticity of its structure may be the reason why this type is the most popular of all of them, especially in *narrative* prose; in fact nine-tenths of all novels are written in a style which may be reduced to either of the two formulas (2 a and b). It will be sufficient to quote a few lines from *David Copperfield*; the third sentence in the first chapter corresponds to formula b): "It was remarked that the clock began to strike, and I began

¹ A careful analysis of the style of some of these writers will be found in Brewster's *Studies in Structure and Style*, and in Hunt's *English Prose and Prose-Writers*.

to cry, simultaneously." The following sentence from the same novel illustrates formula a): "Often when we were at work, and she was sitting by, I would see her pausing and looking at him with that memorable face." It is to be expected that type b) should be more popular than a), because it allows greater freedom in handling loosely-woven structures, and an easy flow of associations is one of the main characteristics of narrative. If this tendency becomes very marked, as, for instance, in Dickens' prose, type 2 b) will be frequently replaced by type 2 of the associative order, or at least by a type, which may show the characteristics of the associative group, though, as will be seen later, it may not deserve to be called "intuitive."

To return with a few words to type 4, it is true that this type, from the æsthetic point of view, will always have to be regarded as a model, and the writers, who cultivate it, deserve the leading position ascribed to them in books on rhetoric. But on the other hand, the fact ought to be taken into consideration that only a very small percentage of books are written in this style and that almost all the speaking and writing done by the average person shows quite a different character from the ideal analytical type. Wundt, in his lectures on Human and Animal Psychology, maintains that the well-known saying "man thinks" is in reality nothing but an old metaphysical prejudice: "I am inclined to hold that man thinks very little and seldom. Many an action which looks like a manifestation of intelligence most surely originates in association. Besides this, man is constantly translating acts of logical thought back again into customary associations. . . . By practice we can reduce anything to association. Trains of thought which at first involved considerable intellectual labor are completed with increasing certainty and mechanical facility the oftener they are repeated. . . . For this reason, thought proper is continually engaged with permanent mental associations at the same time that it is making new ideational connections." (Creighton's and Titchener's translation, p. 363). In a similar way we might say that style proper is something very rare and that most of our writing and speaking consists in following the natural train of associations, the ready-made thought-forms, without attempting to organize them into a higher unit

and to perform an intellectual or rather ideational process.¹ It is therefore to these simpler forms of expression that we should turn in order to analyze the prevailing types of prose from a psychological point of view.

II, 3. This type is called "*interlocked*" on account of its complexity and involved structure. It represents a preliminary stage of four, inasmuch as it shows an attempt to apperceive larger units of thought, but the results are not satisfactory because either the language has not fully developed its syntactical resources or the writer neglects to reduce his involved periods to the strictly analytical type. It is evident that philosophical prose is most apt to fall into this mistake. The field of consciousness is unusually large and though a central idea is clearly perceived it is entangled in a network of restrictive or modifying clauses and parentheses.² I need hardly mention that Kant is the classic representative of this style and that the majority of German philosophers, above all Hegel, followed his bad example. One of Kant's favorite constructions is an ascending period opening with a conditional or causal clause, the term consequent being as a rule introduced by the particle "so." The experienced reader of Kant, who first takes a bird's-eye view of the period, appreciates this little word as a kind of a light-house or guide-post, the existence and location of which is a matter of great importance to the traveller before starting out on his adventurous journey. The frequency of this ascending construction in Kant's writings is unquestionably due to his

¹ We know of a few instances in which a writer's style is the organic expression of his individuality to such a remarkable degree that his style will be reflected even in the colloquial forms of his speech. This is, for instance, true of Goethe, who, according to the testimonies of various persons, spoke exactly as he wrote (cf. *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, 17, 62). As a rule, however, the spoken sentence represents the analytical stage in a more or less rough form, while the organizing act of the process of 'Gliederung' is the main function of the higher types of style.

² From a strictly psychological point of view the obscurity of the interlocked type is explained by the general law about the normal range of attention, according to which man is not able to perceive distinctly more than three or four disconnected impressions of a complex character. Cf. Wundt, *Psycholog. Psychologie*, II, 286 ff.

mathematical training, and the skeleton of some of the most involved structures corresponds in fact exactly to supposition and proof of a theorem; but the heavy cargo of limitations, parentheses and accessories, which is loaded upon the framework, covers the outlines entirely, so that the first impression is anything but that of an analysis. The following period, which is the basis of our graphical transcription (see above, p. 394) may be quoted as an illustration of this ascending construction: "If the empirical philosopher had no other purpose with his antithesis ($\widehat{a\bar{b}}$), but to put down the rashness and presumption of reason in mistaking her true purpose ($\widehat{c\bar{d}}$) while boasting of insight and knowledge ($\widehat{e\bar{f}}$) where insight and knowledge come to an end ($\widehat{g\bar{h}}$), nay, while representing what might have been allowed to pass on account of practical interests ($\widehat{i\bar{k}}$) as a real advancement of speculative interests ($\widehat{e_1\bar{f}_1}$), in order, when it is so disposed, either to tear the thread of physical enquiry ($\widehat{l\bar{m}}$) or to fasten it under the pretence of enlarging our knowledge, to those transcendental ideas ($\widehat{l_1\bar{m}_1}$) which really teach us that we know nothing ($\widehat{o\bar{p}}$);—if, I say, the empiricist were satisfied with this ($\widehat{a_1\bar{b}_1}$), then his principle would only serve ($\widehat{A\bar{B}}$) to teach moderation in claims, modesty in assertions ($\widehat{C\bar{D}}$) and encourage the greatest possible enlargement of our understanding through the true teacher, given to us, namely experience ($\widehat{C_1\bar{D}_1}$)." (Max Müller's translation, pp. 409–10).

The interlocked type has, for various reasons, crept also into historical, scientific and even narrative prose, not to speak of German newspaper style. There are a few English writers, who indulge in this mode of writing, especially those of the 16th and 17th centuries (Richard Hooker, Walter Raleigh, Philip Sidney), and in later times, for instance, Coleridge and Carlyle; but on the whole it is true that this type is representative of a large class of German writings, and this feature of German prose has justly been regarded as one of its main deficiencies. A discussion of this matter will raise several interesting questions, but it seems advisable to postpone the settling of them to another chapter (pp. 414 ff.), in which investigations will be made to what extent the psychological treatment of stylistic problems is deter-

mined and modified by the inner history of a language and by the subject matter with which the writer has to deal.

I, 2 and 3. Leaving the discussion of the sentence-structure, which is called here "synthetic" (II, 5) until the last, we pass on to the *associative* types. In order to bring out the fundamental difference between the apperceptive and associative groups, it will be necessary to enter into a short digression about a certain force, which influences the processes of association considerably, namely *imagination*. To begin with, imagination is, as well as understanding an apperceptive process, but it rises directly from and remains in closer touch with the associations. The main difference is that in the case of understanding, a unit of thought is analyzed by being taken apart, by comparing the different components and determining their relation to each other; in the case of imagination a unit is analyzed by being compared to other units which are a reproduction of experiences or those analogous to experience. In one case the aim is to explain a thing by showing its components and measuring them by abstract concepts, in the other case to make the object in itself stand out as clear as possible by conceiving it as a whole, as something individual and measuring it by other objects—in other words by using metaphors and pictures. As the distinction is rather important, it may be permitted to use a simile. The process of understanding is like taking a watch apart, while imagination would leave it as a whole and try to visualize the idea of a watch by comparing it to other objects and impressing one as strongly as possible with a vivid picture of it.

The question arises as to how this process influences language? It is true that even in most types of the apperceptive order the power of imagination is noticeable, because the majority of associative elements in a sentence arise through the power of the imaginative process. Yet in all these types, that are called here apperceptive, the associations never gain the upper hand, but are controlled by the clear perception of a unit of thought. Herein they mainly differ from the associative types, in which the power of imagination is stronger than that of the logical thought and puts its stamp upon language by subjoining associative

clauses more or less profusely. These associative clauses do not tend to organize or analyze a unit, but to strengthen and vivify it by adding new impressions, pictures and metaphors, and by establishing thus a clear perception on the basis of intuition rather than of a minute analysis.

According to Wundt¹ imagination is active in two main directions: if the power of visualizing a single object is more fully developed, we may speak of *intuitive* imagination, while the power of combining separate units of thought or making new ideational connections might be termed *combinating* imagination. Accordingly there may be distinguished two different types of sentence-structure, reflecting in either case the underlying mental process. Both of them are represented in every literature and since imagination is one of the chief forces in the production of art, it is to be expected that these types in their extreme forms should be the vehicle of poetical prose in the same manner as the apperceptive types tend towards logical thought and scientific prose.

As to the *intuitive* type, it may be regarded as the most perfect type of the associative order in so far as it is more highly organized than the primitive form and yet not influenced by apperceptive forces like the combining type. All it attempts is to vivify a certain unit of thought by calling up in the mind of the reader a definite visual image of what has been seen or experienced. We shall find this type especially in writers of emotional intensity, whose strength lies not so much in a calm epic flow of narrative, as in a vivid imagination, great phrasal power and strong convictions resulting rather from emotion than from thought,—in short, qualities which make the writer a poet. Such is the prose of Herder, Goethe (during his first period), Hölderlin, Heine, George Eliot, Ruskin, George Meredith, Emerson, to mention only representative writers. The first sentence from Eliot's *Romola* may serve as an illustration (cf. plan of symbolic letters, I, 2): "More than three centuries and a half ago, in the mid spring-time of 1492, we are sure that the angel of the dawn, as he travelled with broad slow wing from the Levant to the Pillars of Hercules, and from the

¹ *Physiological Psychology*, 4th ed., Vol. II, p. 445.

summits of the Caucasus across all the snowy Alpine ridges to the dark nakedness of the western isles, saw nearly the same outline of firm land and unstable sea—saw the same great mountain shadows on the same valleys as he has seen to-day—saw olive mounts, and pine forests, and the broad plains, green with young corn or rain-freshened grass—saw the domes and spires of cities rising by the river sides or mingled with the sedge-like masts on the many-curved sea coast, in the same spots where they rise to-day.” Another noteworthy example is Ruskin’s description of St. Mark’s in his *Stones of Venice*: “Beyond those troops of ordered arches there rises a vision out of the earth,” etc.

I, 3. The *combining* type is undoubtedly the most complex form of sentence-structure, and this seems natural if we examine the psychological basis of it. Combining imagination does not attempt to create a vivid mental image of an object in the readers’ mind, but to make new ideational connections, which sometimes only upon closer examination prove to form a higher unity (unless indeed the drift of ideas becomes too rapid and takes the character of fancy-flights as in the case of mental derangements). The fertile imagination of the poet produces one aggregate idea after the other; each of these is more or less distinctly apperceived and forms a unit in itself, yet without being analyzed but rather being considered as a totality. The character of this style is therefore apt to be somewhat desultory and while the boldness of combinations and power of invention may be a source of æsthetic pleasure, the result is often unsatisfactory, partly because the reader is not able to perceive the predominating idea, partly because the sentence-structure will likewise show a desultory character and in many ways resemble the interlocked type. The combining type is not likely to be found in writers who excel on the intuitive side and vice versa, because of the almost opposite qualities of these two forms of imagination: one resulting from a concrete mind observing the phenomena of the outside world, the other from an inward life of thought and fancy. One of the few writers, who combine both sides, is Goethe, at least during his Storm and Stress

period; if we add to this the purely apperceptive character of his later writings, we realize once more the universality of his mind even as reflected in his style.¹ Other representatives of the combining type are, in German, Herder and Jean Paul, in English Sterne and Carlyle; the following passage is taken from Jean Paul's novel *Titan* (cf. table of letters, I, 3): "To that soul, the morning dew of whose ideals has changed into a steady rain—and to that heart which in the subterranean walks of life meets only dry wrinkled mummies walking through catacombs leaning on staves,—and to the eye impoverished and forsaken, in which no man will ever delight again,—and to that proud son of God, whom his lack of faith and lonely solitary breast chain to an eternal unchanging sorrow—to all these thou, O reviving nature with thy flowers and mountains and cataracts, art faithful and consoling, and the bleeding Son of God, silent and cold shakes the drops of pain out of his eyes that they may gaze clear and far over thy volcanoes and thy springs and thy suns." (Hempel edition, p. 15.)

A comparison between this passage and the one from Kant quoted above will convince any one that the favorite term "loose structure" is absolutely inadequate to characterize either one or the other type from a psychological or any other scientific point of view. Kant's prose is purely apperceptive, Jean Paul's associative; with the former writer the so-called loose structure is caused by carrying the process of analysis to a point which lies beyond the normal field of consciousness, in the latter case the apperceptive volitional power is constantly thwarted by the searching for new ideational connections and metaphors. The effect produced upon the reader may be in both cases that of a hypertrophy of the organs of style, if measured by the analytic ideal, but the underlying motives are as different as the two

¹ It has to be emphasized, however, that Goethe's strength lies most decidedly in the direction of intuitive imagination (*anschauliches Denken*), whereas Schiller's style is characterized by a rapid moving train of thought and by a certain richness and splendor of metaphors, the power of close observation being very limited (cf. Elster, *Principien der Literaturwissenschaft*, I, pp. 108, 114, 125). The reason why his prose does not reflect the combining character of his imagination, has to be sought in the strong counteracting effect of his analytic power.

main forms of intellectual activity: logical thought and imagination.

II, 5. A few words remain to be said about the *synthetic* type. It has been stated before that we survey a unit of thought twice: before and after the analysis. Type 5 rests upon the supposition that the writer himself enters into the synthetic stage and that, after having perceived his idea and analyzed it, he reproduces it in a condensed form. The reader therefore receives not the analysis of the unit as the final result, but the second synthesis, which in the other types he has to obtain himself by apperceiving the gist of the whole period. This explanation might seem rather far-fetched, but I confess that in studying writers like, for instance, Tacitus or Emerson, it seemed to me wrong to classify them under type 1 or 2, simply because their sentences are very short. Everybody knows that, in spite of this virtue Emerson is not light reading, because many sentences imply the contents of a whole period. But the connecting links, which lead up to the goal and down again, are missing and this gives his style that desultory character, or, if a simile may be permitted, his sentences seem like a row of islands without bridges. What we call 'jumping' is in reality only the lacking of such bridges; all modifying elements are thrown aside in the very moment of apperceiving the goal, in order to impress the main idea upon the reader and leave it to him to substitute the connecting parts. It is the style of a man who in an assertive and apodictic manner puts down his convictions, without troubling himself about ifs and buts. The following specimens from one of Emerson's essays (*Circles*) will illustrate this condensed, synthetic type: "There are no fixtures in nature. The universe is fluid and volatile. Permanence is but a word of degrees. Our globe seen by God, is a transparent law, not a mass of facts. The law dissolves the fact and holds it fluid. Our culture is the predominance of an idea which draws after it this train of cities and institutions. Let us rise into another idea; they will disappear." (As to the intuitive element in Emerson's style, see below, p. 416).

In German, writers like H. Grimm, Novalis and Scherer seem to show a tendency in the synthetic direction; with H. Grimm

it seems all the more plausible as he is the prophet and herald of Emerson's philosophy in Germany. One of the most striking instances is the style of Tacitus, though of course the more pronounced attributive character of the ancient languages and the greater freedom with regard to word-order facilitate synthetic unity (cf. Weil, *Order of Words*, p. 35 ff.; 77; Wundt, p. 354; 359). The following chapter is taken from Tacitus, *Germania*, chap. 21: "Convictibus et hospitibus non alia gens effusius indulget. Quemcunque mortalium arcere testis nefas habetur; pro fortuna quisque apparatus exulis excipit. Cum defecere, qui modo hospes fuerat, monstrator hospitii et comes; proximam domum non invitati adeunt; nec interest: pari humanitate accipiuntur; notum ignotumque quantum ad jus hospitii nemo discernit. Abeunto, si quid poposcerit, concedere moris, et poscendi invicem eadem facilitas. Gaudent muneribus, sed nec data imputant nec acceptis obligantur. Victus inter hospites comis."

It is interesting to notice that the two extremes of the apperceptive group seem almost alike at first sight. A careful analysis, however, shows that they form a kind of a circle, in which the famous, though much misused, principle of economy of mental energy (cf. Spencer's *Philosophy of Style*) manifests itself in a remarkable way: a wide field of consciousness is surveyed without expending more energy than it took to oversee a narrow one, or in other words: type 5 endeavors to accomplish the task of type 4 with the means of type 1. This fact alone will sufficiently illustrate the futility of measuring the average length of sentences in a writer and of relying entirely on such statistics; these may be, on the other hand, very useful as a support of proofs which rest upon an organic conception.

It has been emphasized above that this article does not claim more than to present one point of view. Only the greatest variety of applied principles can do full justice to the complexity of stylistic problems. Five such principles have been named in the introduction, but it is of course beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the way in which they act upon each other. The only question which will be briefly treated is: how the

results obtained by psychological methods are determined, confirmed or modified by the other principles. An answer is given by first determining the normal sphere and spontaneous growth of the psychic element, and after that bringing it into relation to the other principles.

In examining first the normal growth of language from the psychological view, we find that in the life of the individual as in that of a community there are typical stages of development, to which certain types of sentence structure correspond.¹ The primitive polysyndeton, as stated above (p. 394) is characteristic of the child's speech.² As to the period of transition we find either the intuitive type (if the emotional life is more developed) or the interlocked type; it has been frequently noticed that high school and college students tend at first to heavy style, and gradually learn to shorten their clauses.³ From the mature man we would expect more settled forms, such as the narrative or analytic type, according to temperament and character of work. The extreme types of the apperceptive order are highly individual, and not included in the normal growth.

Similar observations can be made on the phylogenetic side, yielding even more positive results. The extent to which certain forms of the attributive sentence-type are preserved in a great many primitive languages has been discussed and illustrated by Wundt (p. 330 ff.). The primitive type is likewise to be found in modern dialects, and as these often preserve previous styles of the literary language, it is to be expected that the same

¹ The question as to parallels which may be drawn between the ontogenetic and phylogenetic growth of language, has been frequently discussed, especially in connection with the numerous investigations about infantile linguistics which have sprung up during the last ten years. A full list of books and articles concerning this subject will be found in a recent contribution by E. Meumann: *Die Entstehung der ersten Wortbedeutungen beim Kinde, Philosophische Studien*, ed. by Wundt, vol. xx, p. 213.—An extensive use of this parallel has been made by Sherman, *Analytics of Literature*, pp. 269 ff.

² Cf. Ament, *Speechen u. Denken beim Kinde* (Leipzig, 1899), p. 185: 'Endlose Coordination von Sätzen ist sehr beliebt.' See also the letters of children on pp. 187 ff.

³ Cf. Sherman, *University of Nebraska Studies*, vol. i, p. 363; it is probable, however, that the influence of Latin diction or the study of literary style in general, accounts for this tendency to a certain extent.

structure should prevail, for instance, in the Old or Middle High German literature.¹ That this supposition is true to some extent, may be illustrated by a passage from a popular sermon of the fourteenth century (treating of the miracles of St. Elizabeth of Thuringia): "In irre kintheit, dô si wart loufende in deme hûse, dô stal si allez das si begreif, daz man ezzen unde trinken mochte unde gap iz den armen. Dô si die koche vormelditen und daz gesinde, dô wartit iz der herre selber; und dô si ûz der kuchin ginc und hate iren gêren vol geladen, dô begegnete her ir und sprach: libez tochterchîn, waz treist du? Dô sprach si: ich trage rôsen und will ein schapel machen. Dô sprach her: wîse mir di rôsen, wanne her wiste wol daz iz brôt unde vleisch was. Dô warf si ûf den gêren: dô wâren iz allez rôte rôsen und wîze, und in der armen lâte hant wart iz wider brôt und vleisch." (Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker*, vol. I, 242).²

If we compare with this passage another Old German sermon, which shows quite a periodic structure, though it dates from an earlier time, we realize at once the powerful influence of other agencies, which thwart the normal growth of style. In this particular instance it is the effect that Latin, the literary language of the Middle Ages, exerted upon national thought and expression, and which may be traced in the following specimen from a sermon of the 11th century, written under the influence of Gregory's homilies: "Fore sînere kiburte sô santi er die patriarchas unde die prophetas. Suie unole die kiuuorhte nâh sînere hulde, sô ni phiegin si doh sâ nieth des lônis, unande si alla zi helli fuoren. Ava nû zi gunste siet sînere kiburti, dô santi er die boton. Suie die zi jungisti chômen, sô inphiegen si doh folliz lôn, unande in daz himelrîh offen stuont, sô si allerêrist got volgetin, sô iz auh noh uns allen tuot, suenne uuir unsih durhnahtlîchen bichêrin." (*Müllenhoff und Scherer's Denk-*

¹ As to Early English, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle offers copious illustrations of the coordination of clauses. Cf. Sherman, *Analytics of Literature*, p. 270.

² It is of interest to notice here the same tendency towards a liberal use of demonstrable particles of time and space, which we observed in the child's speech. Both these cases agree with the general law stated by Wundt (pp. 417, 456) that an abundance of demonstrative pronouns is highly characteristic of the concrete thinking of primitive languages.

mäler, I, 278; cf. interpretation, vol. II, 423 f.). It would be easy enough, however, to quote from the same source other passages which, as to their structure, are based upon the primitive-demonstrative type and prove that the original psychic force was strong enough to assimilate foreign influences.

Formative periods are inclined towards an involved grammatical structure, a fact which could be illustrated from both German (15th–17th centuries) and English literature (15th–16th centuries; cf. Hunt, *English Prose*, p. 54). Least of all will the predominance of the analytic type in settled periods be disputed; all literatures from the Golden Latinity to the English prose of the 19th century offer illustrations.¹ As to the highly individual types, they seem to occur mostly in periods of reaction, which are apt to follow epochs of a more periodic structure: a symptom of subjectivity, as for instance in the Silver Latinity and the Romanticism of the 19th century.

This latter problem however touches upon the second part of our investigation, i. e., the question, in what way the psychic factor is determined by the other elements which constitute style. It seems most practical to follow the list of these as given above (p. 390) and discuss each of the four principles in its relation to the psychological view: 1. material; 2. class of writing; 3. method of thinking; 4. process of writing.

I. *Material*. The languages with fixed construction may either give the governing word the precedence over the governed word (descending construction) or place the former after the latter (ascending construction), and the same distinction may be made in respect to the period.² The ancient languages enjoyed considerable liberty in arranging both words and sentences; of the modern languages French and English tend to descending, German to ascending construction. These general tendencies explain why certain types of sentence-structure are characteristic

¹The evolution from a more involved to a clear analytic construction is clearly indicated by the fact that in several modern languages a gradual shortening of sentences has taken place since the 16th century. This has been observed in French (cf. *American Journal of Philology*, VI, 344) and in English (L. A. Sherman, *University of Nebraska Studies*, I, 337 ff.; *Analytics of Literature*, p. 256 ff.).

²Weil, *Order of Words*, pp. 59, 75.

of certain languages. The ancient languages with their greater freedom, their interlocked periods, verbal nouns, etc., were better enabled to bring out the synthetical unity,¹ and the concise style of Tacitus greatly profited by this. French and English prefer the analytic types, while the ascending character of the German calls for synthetic forms, in which the period is bound together. This tendency towards the involved period in German is even encouraged by the final position of the verb in dependent clauses and by the separation of the inflected and uninflected parts of the verb. It may be, that the striving after synthetic unity is more characteristic of German thought than the clear analysis and decomposition, at any rate there is a causal connection between the frequency of the interlocked type and the ascending construction. The contrast between Macaulay and Ranke is quite striking in this respect; the German historian tends to the ascending, the English to the descending structure.²

Next to the organic character of a language, its *history* or rather the agencies which have checked or furthered the growth of the language, have to be considered. Nothing has done more harm to the steady development of the German language than the absence of political life and public speaking; the consequence was that the spoken and written language each lived a separate life: one had no models to follow except those set up by the needs of the day, while the other by following foreign models and lacking the stimulating influence of oratorical prose, grew into a bookish language, and had no occasion to develop a simple, clear and incisive style.³

¹ Wundt, p. 354; Weil, p. 77.

² Whenever a German writer uses descending types, it is safe to assume foreign influence; thus in the case of Lessing's style, as was keenly observed by Jean Paul (Works, Hempel edition, 52, 181).

³ One of the few critics of the 18th century, who recognized this national calamity, was Thomas Abbt (cf. Philippi, *Kunst der Rede*, pp. 123 ff.). It is worthy of mention that Goethe likewise was deeply impressed with this fact, and that he referred to it in his conversation with the two Americans Ticknor and Everett, who saw him in 1816: "Here we have no eloquence—our preaching is a monotonous, middling declamation—public debate we have not at all, and if a little inspiration sometimes comes to us in our lecture-rooms, it is out of place, for eloquence does not teach." *Gespräche*, 3, 271. A similar statement is reported by Eckermann, *Gespr.*, 5, 64.

Furthermore the dependence on Latin models was a natural consequence of the same unfortunate lack of national life, and this Latin influence proved to be one of the strongest agencies in thwarting the organic growth as determined by psychological laws. It is true that the English language likewise had to pass through a period, in which the study of Latin during the Humanistic movement left its stamp upon the grammatical diction.¹ Another adverse agency in the history of the English literary style was the so-called Euphuism, which was imported from Spain and is exhibited in the writings of Philip Sidney and John Lylye.² But all these disturbances in the history of English prose were far less serious than the disastrous influence both of Latin³ and of the bureaucratic language⁴ upon German style. These foreign or artificial models were fatal, because the spoken language did not produce any models out of its own resources; hence a literary language could only arise through the medium of books or official documents which had to be understood by everybody. The bureaucratic style is, however, the last source from which a simple narrative prose would receive a stimulating influence. It is not until the Storm and Stress and Romantic movements that the living language was utilized for higher literary purposes; the German prose has now reached the stage which the English occupied more than a century ago.

This short sketch will be sufficient to prove that the psychological interpretation of style has to be supplemented by the historical view, and that psychic forces may be given a different direction or altogether checked by more powerful agencies. As to German prose-style, however, a few words may be added concerning less the objective view and actual development than the subjective criticism, which has been passed upon German

¹ Cf. Hunt, *English Prose*, pp. 56, 251, 311. A typical Anglo-Latin writer is Richard Hooker, whose prose is more or less based on the interlocked type; cf. J. Payne, *Studies in English Prose*, p. 99.

² Cf. Landmann, *der Euphuismus*. Dissert., Giessen, 1881.

³ A. Socin, *Schriftsprache und Dialecte*, pp. 191 ff. The radical difference between Latin and German periodic structure has, besides Abbt, been stated with remarkable clearness and emphasis by Herder (*Über die Verschiedenheit der lateinischen und deutschen Perioden*, Works, Hempel, 24, 261 ff.).

⁴ Socin, *Schriftsprache*, pp. 164-198.

style. While its shortcomings are very evident, it is no less true that they have often been misrepresented and that it has been held responsible for the palpable defects of a few writers. The criticism which De Quincey passed upon the German language,¹ may be regarded as typical of the prevailing view especially among the English-speaking nations. De Quincey cannot find strong enough words to express his utter disgust with German style, but it is characteristic that he refers almost exclusively to Kant as an illustration. It would be absurd to defend Kant or any of the German philosophers (except Schopenhauer and Nietzsche) as to their prose-style, but it ought not to be overlooked that even in the 18th century there were as good prose-writers in Germany as anywhere, such as Lessing, Möser, Lichtenberg, Thümmel, Forster,—not to speak of Goethe himself, and that the age of Romanticism and of the so-called “Young Germany” produced an abundance of good prose. If therefore De Quincey maintains that “German prose, as written by the mob of authors, presents, as in an . . . exaggerating mirror, the most offensive faults of our own” (*Essay on Style*, p. 34), this statement is wrong and based on such extremes as that of the philosopher of Königsberg. The reason why this prejudice could be established, may be seen in the fact, that German metaphysics was studied and appreciated at a much earlier time than German literature at large.

De Quincey's sharp censure, whether it was justified or not, might teach us however something else; namely the utter failure of the dogmatic view in matters of style. Nobody who approaches these problems from a historical or psychological side, would take it for granted that a whole nation consists of either dunces or bunglers, and he would be convinced that certain tendencies, which are noticeable in the style of a foreign nation and remain unchanged through centuries, must be deeply rooted in the whole psychic structure of the nation. It is true that the material which the German writer has to handle, is not favorable to a clear analytic style, but we have now learnt to look upon limitations not only in the light of an obstacle but of a stimulating force and opportunity. In his criticism of Spencer's

¹ Thomas De Quincey, *Essays on Style*, ed. by F. N. Scott, pp. 31, 34, 182, 210.

Philosophy of Style, T. H. Wright tries to interpret Spencer's saying: "to have a specific style is to be poor in speech," and finds that "style at all owes its existence to the imperfection of the vehicle of thought."¹ In a similar way Walter Pater in his *Essay on Style* maintains that "the art of the scholar is summed up in the observance of those regulations demanded by the nature of his medium, the material he must use."² Given a language, which tends to *involved* diction, it will be found that its periods *evolve* a greater synthetic unity than the analytic type can ever produce. The separating of the inflected and uninflected parts of the verb as well as the position of subordinate clauses³ both presuppose and require a constructive mind, a power of organization and a striving for organic unity.

This point of view, to exemplify and dilate upon which, lies outside of our province, has been well set forth by F. N. Finck,⁴ who interprets the involved German period as a proof "of an unusual power of will and mental energy," p. 477; "the truly German tendency towards an involved structure (*Einschachteln*) gives not only evidence of intellectual labor accomplished, but furnishes at the same time the best obtainable lesson, how to perform such a task," p. 570. It has to be admitted that narrative prose, as a rule, will suffer from the use of the involved structure, and it is to be regretted, that even such writers as Heinr. von Kleist do not realize the unfitness of it in a novel, and in such a dramatic novel as Michael Kohlhaas.⁵ But in reading, for instance, Gottfried Keller or Raabe, or even Goethe, we are on the other hand struck with the redeeming qualities and availability of this type, if not carried to an extreme. In how far epic prose may be greatly benefitted by this kind of diction has been pointed out by O. Ludwig, the poet and critic, in one of his suggestive "Studien," which may be quoted here at length: "Short sentences impart to style a jumping, hurried

¹ Spencer, *Philosophy of Style*, etc., ed. by Scott, p. 57.

² Walter Pater, *Appreciations*, p. 9.

³ Cf. Wunderlich, *Der deutsche Satzbau*, 2nd ed., I, 404.

⁴ Der deutsche Sprachbau als Ausdruck deutscher Weltanschauung. *Die Neueren Sprachen*, vol. VI.

⁵ Cf. for instance, works ed. by Muncker, vol. 4, p. 63, the long period, beginning with: "Nicht nur, dass," etc.

character, which is not in keeping with epic calmness and epic comfort. They remind somewhat of the direct straight line, which may correspond to descriptive prose, but least of all to epic poetry, that takes pleasure and enjoyment out of its own course. They especially stand in opposition to the novel, which in the whole presentation of the story imitates the involved character of the period. In the character of the period we find already expressed, what is called the indirect, i. e., retarding element of the epic poem. The beauty, which lies in the turnings and windings of the individual incidents, in the way these are interlocked and bound together, may be reflected, on a smaller scale, in the structure of the sentence."¹

II. *Class of Writing.* Very little need be said about the relation of the psychological view to the classes of prose style. If we were to group the representative literary forms under the heads of the eight sentence-types which are the basis of our investigation, the following plan would represent normal conditions: Apperceptive group: 1. aphoristic; 2. narrative; 3. philosophical; 4. historical, scientific; 5. aphoristic. Associative group: 1. narrative, folk poetry; 2. oratorical; 2 or 3. descriptive, poetical prose.

There are, of course, many exceptions to this arrangement, owing to the powerful action of the two individual forces, which will be discussed next: the philosophy of the writer and his methods of working. But it will be found, on the other hand, that a man is apt to do most of his literary work in that type which is characteristic of his representative writings. As an illustration I refer to the influence which the *oratorical* form has had upon several writers whose life work was lecturing or preaching. Thus Herder's prose betrays throughout the preacher, and is mostly written in the intuitive type. The same is true of Emerson; his style exhibits, however, two features, partly the condensed synthetic form, which appeals to the reader more through emphatic statements, partly the emotional character of the intuitive type. Both forms have this feature in common, that they are strongly rhetorical; they are born out of and appeal to an affective state of mind.

¹ Otto Ludwig, Werke, vol. vi, 183 f.

Emerson was preëminently a lecturer, and the fact that his productions were conceived in the form of orations, explains both the strong and weak side of his style: his pithiness, energy and sententiousness on one hand, and the discontinuity of thought, abruptness and even incorrectness on the other hand.¹

A rhetorical figure, which will almost invariably occur in the intuitive type, is the *anaphora*, the repetition of one or more words, to intensify each successive statement and thus produce the effect of a rhetorical climax. Both Emerson and Herder use this figure abundantly; George Eliot is likewise very fond of it.

III. *Philosophy*. One would naturally expect that the intellectual process, which underlies all writing, should be reflected in style, but it seems extremely difficult and next to impossible to classify the types of sentence-structure from this point of view, because of the infinite variety of individual forms of thinking. The ratio in which the elements of logical thought and imagination are mixed, is in reality identical with the individuality of the writer himself, and a history of prose-style, which is based upon the individual point of view, has to determine this ratio in every individual case. The only way of reducing the individual cases to a certain number of types, might be found in such classifications, as the one offered by Wundt:² by intercrossing the two forms of understanding (deductive and inductive) with the two forms of imagination (intuition and combination) four types of thinking are obtained: observation, invention, analysis, speculation. But it is questionable, whether even this classification, as applied to the types of sentence-structure, would be more than a mechanical one. Much simpler is the question, in how far the predominance of imagination or understanding in a writer influences his productions;³ it is obvious that the almost opposite style of such men as Lessing and Sterne can be easily traced back to the totally different organization of the two minds.

¹ Cf. Hunt's analysis, *Studies in Literature and Style*, pp. 246-278; also Morley, *Critical Miscellanies*, I, 313 ff., where Emerson's style is very aptly termed 'staccato.'

² *Physiological Psychology*, fourth ed., II, 496.

³ Elster, *Principien der Literaturwissenschaft*, pp. 75-145, where Goethe, Schiller and Lessing are analyzed from this point of view, without touching, however, upon their style.

With regard to certain specific forms of the intellectual process, little need be said about the metaphorical power, unless it be excessively developed. In that instance the combining or intuitive type of sentence-structure will be the natural form of expression (Carlyle, Sterne, Jean Paul, etc.). Far more important is *antithesis*, which, as a rule, is ranked among the so-called rhetorical figures, but in reality is a fundamental form of the intellectual process, as has been justly emphasized by Elster.¹ A clear definition can be obtained by contrasting it with the metaphor; the latter is a product of simultaneous association (cf. Wundt, p. 557) and appeals to imagination, in so far as it results from thinking in concrete ideas and units of thought. Antithesis rests upon successive associations; it appeals to understanding and aims at explaining an idea by contrasting it with another one. It is obvious that metaphor as a rule will not be reflected by the sentence-structure, because, it merely substitutes one unit of thought for another one. Antithesis, on the contrary, depends entirely on the logical form of thought and impresses itself upon the grammatical diction in an unmistakable manner. In fact, the contrasted structure is one of the chief forms of the analysis and has always been most popular in historical and scientific prose. It is undoubtedly organic in many instances, but the very character of it explains, why it has often become a mere rhetorical figure and why even the best writers have not been able to escape this danger. The two main sentence-types of the antithesis are the isolating and analytical types; the former, if the two statements are set over against each with incisive forcefulness, the latter, if the whole period is organized antithetically. The most important representatives in English are Johnson and Macaulay;² in German, Schiller,³ Lessing⁴ and Scherer; the antithetic apperception of Scherer explains his extensive use of the isolating type, and the

¹ *Principien*, pp. 395 ff.

² Hunt, *English Prose*, pp. 402 ff. The author takes the occasion to point out the interesting fact that "in poetry and prose alike all successful *satirists* have dealt largely in counter statement. Butler in *Hudibras*; Pope in *The Dunciad*; Dryden in his epistles; Swift in his allegories and Addison in his papers have all freely used it."

³ Elster, *Principien*, p. 398.

⁴ E. Schmidt, *Lessing*, II, 2, 717.

way in which he carries this method of counter-statements to mannerism, has often been severely criticised.

No less than the process of thinking is the philosophy of the writer reflected in style, and in this respect more than in any other, a mechanology of style is absolutely helpless. Even the psychological laws will have to submit to this most powerful of all agencies, but it would be futile to draw up any generalizing schemes, as each individual case represents a world of its own, which in its complexity and mixture cannot be measured by any typical standards.

IV. *Process of Writing.* A few words may be added about the way in which the normal psychological growth is affected by the process and method of working. It would be simple enough to trace the unity between man and style, if we had not to realize the fact that style is often something artificial, fostered by imitating certain models, which in their turn are dictated by aesthetic doctrines or fashions. No better example could be found than the style of Flaubert the "martyr of literary style;"¹ in instances of this kind the spontaneous action of psychological laws is almost entirely neutralized by the process of voluntary artistic production.

In studying the sentence-structure of a writer, his method of working should be taken into account, before drawing inferences as to the psychological and causal connection. Since the higher analytic forms are apt to follow certain models or doctrines more or less intentionally, there is no question that the simpler types, as stated repeatedly, offer a more reliable and accessible basis for studying the problem of the relation between thought and language.²

¹ Walter Pater, *Appreciations*, p. 24; G. Brandes, *Moderne Geister*, pp. 291, 308.

² The more artificial and bookish a man's style, the more his writings will differ from his spoken language; hence it seems very plausible that Johnson, whose style was to a large extent the conscious imitation of Latinic diction should have been a different man as soon as he talked. "He had a kind of a dual personality. One was for the coffee-house and the street; the other was for the desk." Hunt, *English Prose*, p. 323; or, as Macaulay puts it: "When he wrote for publication, he did his sentences out of English into Johnsonese." Compare with this the unity of speaking and writing in Goethe (above, p. 401, note).

The foregoing sketch does not claim more than to offer a few suggestions as to the question, in how much the psychic elements in style are determined and modified by other more or less powerful agencies. But even the most accurate analysis of these various forces and their relation to each other will not be able to master a certain irrational element, which may be easily traced in its effects, but less so in its sources: the element of *individuality* itself. We define individuality as that power which vitalizes the material of language, which causes all the various acting forces to appear in every instance in just such and such a constellation, and which finally binds them all together in an *organic unity*. 'All depends upon the original unity, the vital wholeness and identity of the initiatory apprehension or view.'¹ But here before the problem of individuality the scientific investigation leaves the field to the higher forms of synthesis, that present the only adequate expression of what is individual: to *art* and *intuition*. The greater the variety of points of view, the greater the possibility of encircling that which is typical, by logical concepts and judgments, and of eliminating from the complexity of the individual phenomenon everything which may be reduced to a type or formula. The final residuum, however, is irrational, and its congenial reproduction is the province of the artist.²

Whatever means may be employed in determining the typical elements of style, there is no doubt that the *psychological* methods will gain the upper hand and conquer the method of logical subsumption. They are a decided step towards breaking away from the old rhetorical definitions, which have controlled the field ever since the days of Aristotle; they will aid in classifying forms of style, not according to the effect, but to the cause, and in revealing an infinite variety of types instead of a few dogmatic models. Style can only be fully understood by analyzing the growth of thought, before it is born into language.

EWALD A. BOUCKE.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

¹ Pater, *Appreciations*, p. 19.

² Lamprecht, *Zeitschr. für Socialwissenschaft*, vol. II, 13.